Although the Examiner was not prepared to commit to the allowance of the claims without a further search, it is understood that he did agree that the claims as now presented distinguish over the Gotman patent.

Also discussed was the subject of claim 7 which is directed to marking of packaged devices after testing by laser irradiation through a transparent tape which serves as the carrier. Applicant's representative argued that this concept is not taught or disclosed in the Spanjer patent. Applicant's representative also pointed out that the reference in Spanjer to a transparent coating at column 4, lines 49-51 refers to a subsequently applied coating on the marked package and that in any event, this is a description of an unsatisfactory example of prior art over which Spanjer sought to make improvements.

Finally, Applicant's representative drew the Examiner's attention to new claims 23-26 and pointed out to the Examiner where in the specification support was provided for this subject matter. These citations were recorded by the Examiner in his Interview Summary.

For the record, Applicant's representative states that no new matter has been introduced into the application by claims 23-26.

In view of the foregoing, and the amendments and remarks presented in the Response filed on February 25, 2004, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to (703) 872-9306, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 5, 2004:

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Auorence Signature

March 5, 2004
Date of Signature

LAH:sks

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence A Hoffman

Registration No.: 22,436

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

00648571.1

2